The Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter in Claims 3 and 4 is gratefully acknowledged.

In this Office Action, the claims were rejected as follows: Claim 5 and its dependent Claim 6 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Van Kleeck (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,799); Claim 1 and its dependent Claim 2 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kleeck; and Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to comply with the Examiner's suggestion. These amendments are made without prejudice, for purposes of expediting prosecution and are not related to patentability. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Entry of these amendments and consideration of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Rejection:

Claims 1-6 were rejected as lacking antecedent basis under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is submitted that the claims are sufficiently clear. Independent Claims 1 and 3 have, however, been amended for form to comply with the Examiner's suggestion, and not for reasons related to patentability, to expedite prosecution of this application.

Regarding the rejection of Independent Claim 5, the Examiner asserts that the term "said character" in line 3 lacks antecedent basis (Office Action, page 2). It is respectfully submitted that proper antecedent basis is set forth, and the Examiner's attention is directed to line 1 of Claim 5, which properly recites "a character".

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection:

Amended Claim 5 and its dependent Claim 6 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Van Kleeck . It is believed that the Examiner misinterpreted the Remarks presented in the September 12, 2002 Amendment, and Claims 5 and 6 are believed be

-3-

in condition for allowance for the following reasons. It is believed that the Examiner incorrectly assumed "that Applicant's response did affirm that cited art Van Kleeck discloses a character recognition process ... (Top of page 5, paper #4)" (Final Office Action, top of page 8, underlining added). The Examiner's assertion is completely unsupported. It appears that the Examiner relied on the top portion of page 5 of the September 12, 2001 Amendment, which is devoted to a discussion of Kuzuniki patent, not Van Kleeck. Lines 15-17 of page 5 actually assert that "...Van Kleeck is not applicable to the claimed subject matter for reasons including Van Kleeck's inapplicability to character recognition."

Claim 5 recites a method for "recognizing a character input through a touch screen", whereas Van Kleeck merely describes a manner of selecting characters from those presented to the user via the display. The Office Action cited Figs. 3 and 4 and the related description at lines 21-26 of Van Kleeck , which provide a detailed view of an exemplary "letter button" (201) that is presented for the user to make a selection. Neither this citation, nor elsewhere in the disclosure of Van Kleeck, is a character that is "input" by the user through a touch screen for "recognition" disclosed.

The Office Action cites col. 10 (lines 15-17) and col. 6 (lines 28-37) of Van Kleeck, along with the related figures, for purportedly teaching the Claim 5 recitation of "in case that another touch screen data is generated within a predetermined waiting threshold time, stopping the above operation and adding both the previously generated touch screen data and the newly generated touch screen data together as one character to thereby perform the character recognition". At col. 6, however, Van Kleeck merely teaches a method to select separate characters that comprise a word (i.e., selection of the two letters "te" presented on the display followed by selection of letters "x" and "t" presented on the display, to formulate the word "text"). Van Kleeck fails to disclose or teach a method for performing character recognition, and further fails to provide any disclosure of adding previous touch screen data and fresh touch screen data together as one character to perform character recognition. Consequently, the

-4-

threshold time period cited in col. 10 of Van Kleeck does not refer to the circumstances under which freshly stored touch screen data is added to previous touch screen data, as recited in Claim 5.

Claim 5 is believed to be patentable over Van Kleeck, and to be in condition for allowance. Claim 6, which depends upon Claim 5, is believed similarly allowable.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection:

The Office Action again rejected amended Claim 1 and its dependent Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as anticipated by Van Kleeck.

Van Kleeck teaches entering data using an improved on-screen keyboard by selecting a certain character. Van Kleeck first allows a certain character to be selected via a character button, and then allows selection of a second character by dragging the pen in a certain direction (e.g. north, south, east or west – the "flick"). This enters both the character that is first selected by the tapped character button, as well as the character designated by the direction drags the pen (the flick) (Van Kleeck, column 1, line 52-67). In contrast, the device of the claimed invention performs character recognition of stored touch screen data of a character by adding previous touch screen data and fresh touch screen data together as one character.

Van Kleeck provides a double-tap operation on a word button (211) of the on-screen keyboard (104) in a time period less than a "threshold time period" to display other specific words. One or ordinary skill in the art, however, would have recognized that Van Kleeck's threshold time period is merely the time interval between the taps that comprise the double-tap, as necessary to determine whether the user desires to select the entire word that is double-tapped (column 10, line 9-21).

Van Kleeck's timer button (219) displays in a time field (221) an elapsed time that the user has used the on-screen keyboard (104) (column 5, line 53-57). However, the timer button (219) does not refer to the circumstances under which freshly stored touch screen data is

-5-

added to previous touch screen data to complete the character to perform character recognition. Accordingly, Van Kleeck teaches away from the present invention.

As to the discussion regarding the "power saving scheme" for teaching the "timer" recited in Claim 1, it is noted that Van Kleeck's threshold time period does <u>not</u> refer to the circumstances under which freshly stored touch screen data is added to previous touch screen data to complete the character to perform character recognition, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Van Kleeck, and is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 2, which depends upon amended Claim 1, is believed to be similarly allowable.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the foregoing amendments and allowance of all pending claims, namely Claims 1-6, are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference or personal interview will facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below. A prompt action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: <u>March 18, 2002</u>

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
TEL: (516) 228-8484
FAX: (516) 228-8516
PJF/JFG/lah

Paul J. Farrell
Registration No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

-6-

AMENDED CLAIM(S) PRESENTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 37 C.F.R. §1.121

Rewritten claims marked up to show all the changes relative to the previous version:

-- 1. (Twice Amended) A character recognition device for recognizing a character input through a touch screen, comprising:

a touch screen data recorder for storing touch screen data generated from input of <u>one or more strokes</u> [a stroke], wherein said character is recognized in response to <u>said</u> one or more [of said] strokes;

a timer for counting a predetermined waiting threshold time when there is no touch screen data generated; and

a character recognition processor for performing character recognition of said stored touch screen data as said character, wherein a freshly stored touch screen data generated before completion of counting the predetermined waiting threshold time is added to the previous touch screen data to complete said character.

-- 3. (Twice Amended) A character recognition device for recognizing a character input through a touch screen comprising:

a touch screen data recorder for storing touch screen data generated from input of a stroke, wherein said character is recognized in response to [one or more of] said [strokes] <u>stroke or in response to a plurality of strokes</u>;

a timer for counting a predetermined waiting threshold time when there is no touch screen data generated; and

a character recognition processor for performing character recognition of the stored touch screen data at each time when each stroke is input through said touch screen, wherein all the touch screen data are recognized as a single character when said predetermined waiting threshold time is completely counted. --